



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,205	12/31/2003	Alexander Berger	MSFT-2863/306352.1	9206
41505 7590 10/04/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER LIE, ANGELA M	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,205

Applicant(s)

BERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Angela M. Lie

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-18 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 13, and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities:
2. It is unclear from the claim language how first and second persistence rules are different. First rule teaches persisting metadata in the target datastore until source object is altered and the second rule discloses persisting both metadata and data changes. In particular the phrase "data changes" is unclear because, the examiner is not certain which data the applicant has in mind, is it the object data in the datastore? Furthermore it is understood that the target datastore holds data associated with the datasource, therefore it also seems obvious that data in the target datastore would not be modified unless source datasource was altered. Consequently, first and second persistence models seem interchangeable at least until data is modified. The applicant is suggested to amend the claim language to clearly differentiate between those two rules. For instance adding clarification such as: pertaining both metadata and previous data changes made to the datastore despite of the new changes made to the linked source object, would clearly identify the difference between first two rules.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2163

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. **Claims 1, 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hurmiz et al (US Publication No. 2005/0108271).**

As to claims 1, 13 and 22, Hurmiz discloses a method of sharing database objects between a source datastore (Figure 1, element 107) and a target datastore (Figure 1, element 109), comprising the following steps: linking at least one object in the source datastore to an object in the target datastore (paragraph 45, lines 7-11, wherein database 107 can not update or modify specific objects in the data records (109) unless the specific objects in those two datastores are linked and paragraph 84); specifying a persistence model for controlling how changes to the linked source object are handled by the target datastore, the persistence mode further comprising one of persisting metadata in the target datastore such that changes to metadata of the linked source object are not updated in the target datastore until object data of the linked source object is altered (paragraph 26), persisting both metadata and data changes in the target datastore, and persisting neither metadata nor data in the target datastore such

Art Unit: 2163

that any change made to the linked source object is propagated to the target datastore; specifying a refresh policy for refreshing information in the target datastore (paragraph 26, wherein database management system (107) controls the storing, retrieving and updating of data and metadata in database records, and all those functions are associated with a policy (i.e. how often data should be updated etc)); and integrating data from the object in the source datastore to the target datastore (paragraph 26, lines 5-6).

As to claim 2, Hurmiz discloses the method further comprising the step of selecting at least one group of measures in the source datastore as the linked source object (Figure 5, element 503, 505 etc).

As to claim 9, Hurmiz discloses the method further comprising the step of specifying a filter for the target datastore (paragraph 9, wherein specifying who can access the datastore is considered a filter).

As to claim 10, Hurmiz discloses the method wherein the filter limits data accessible by the target datastore to data of a specified type (paragraph 9, wherein it can be specified what type of data each user has a permission to access).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2163

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurmiz et al (US Publication No. 2005/0108271) in view of Le (US Publication No. 2005/0076036).

As to claims 3, 4 and 21, Hurmiz teaches all the limitations disclosed in claim 1, however he does not explicitly teach the source datastore and target datastore being OLAP databases. Le teaches system for updating multidimensional databases, comprising source and target datastores, wherein those datastores are OLAP databases (paragraph 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art during time the invention was made to use OLAP databases as taught by Le, as Hurmiz's source and target datastores, in order to increase the functionality of the system, for instance generating summary of data in the database.

As to claims 7,8 and 18, Hurmiz does not explicitly teach refreshing data each time data in the target datastore is queried or refreshing data whenever the specified time interval has passed. Le teaches the system comprising two databases wherein data is refreshed whenever a user access it and further the user naturally has control over frequency of access (paragraph 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art during time the invention was made to refresh data every time a user access data or refresh according to specified time intervals because setting refresh time policy is very well known in the art, furthermore in order to update data certain policy has to be specified so that the content of the database comprises the most recent information.

As to claims 11,12 and 14-17, Hurmiz teaches all the limitations in claims 1 and 13 respectively, however he does not explicitly teach linked source object being a dimension or a measure group. Le teaches multidimensional databases comprising dimensions and measure group. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the during time the invention was made to use dimensions and group measures as taught by Le, in Hurmiz's source and target datastores in order to improve the information execution time.

8. With respect to claims 16 and 17, Hurmiz teaches linking specific objects (paragraphs 45 and 84).

9. **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurmiz et al (US Publication No. 2005/0108271) in view of Pasumansky (US Publication No. 6477536)**. Hurmiz teaches all the limitations disclosed in claim 13, however he does not explicitly teach source and target datstores residing on two computers. Pasumansky teaches the network comprising the server and client computers wherein systems share common dimensions (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art during time the invention was made to place source and target datastores on separate computers to reduce the traffic to the target datastore. In other words since target and source would share some information (dimensions), all of the client computers would not have to connect only to the target datastore at all time, instead some of them could connect to source database.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The Prior Art

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Wu et al (US Patent No 6981114) disclose method of mirroring data between multiple datastores.

Inquiry

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela M. Lie whose telephone number is 571-272-8445. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.


13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2163

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Angela M Lie

9/30/07

Hung vy
For SPT Don Wanga